

## CHAPTER 7-LAND USE PLAN-VILLAGES & SETTLEMENTS

### ■ BACKGROUND

Fauquier County contains communities ranging widely in size and type, including suburban residential developments which serve the metropolitan area as much as needs generated within the County, incorporated towns, small, rural communities and other types falling within this range. This chapter deals with the small rural villages and settlements scattered throughout the County and serving essential functions in the lives and work of both their residents and the citizens of the County as a whole. These communities were addressed in the 1967 Comprehensive Plan.

The areas involved may be described as historical centers of neighborhood and community interest. They represent unincorporated settlements which provide numerous required services to the people, such as polling places, retail services, shipping points, post offices, civic meeting places, recreational affairs and the like.

In one sense, they represent an “Achilles heel” in the body of the Comprehensive Plan. Because they must be recognized as having true value to the county for needed rural services, and at the same time, due to their scattered locations, must be restricted in expansion, so as to form a sensible pattern of population growth within the County’s economic framework.

For reasons discussed in earlier parts of this plan, especially in the preceding chapter, several of the County’s communities will serve as centers for the growth of the service districts. Others are so located as to be sufficiently independent at this time to be planned as villages, but may become parts of nearby service districts in the future. On the other hand, some communities are remotely situated and cannot be expected to be absorbed into the more urban parts of the county in the foreseeable future.

These communities also vary in type among themselves and from the other more urban related developments in the County. These rural villages have, in general, a different traditional character from that found in relatively recent subdivision. The reasons for their existence, social structure, needs for services, mix of uses and other characteristics are different. Thus, villages and the “suburban residential” portions of the service districts must be treated differently at both the plan formulation stage, and in designing appropriate implementation techniques.

As discussed in Chapter Six, two of the County’s interrelated goals are the preservation of its rural environment and lifestyle, and the concentrating of growth within designated service districts. To accomplish these goals, it is a County policy that service districts be served by public utilities or be planned to receive future services. While villages and settlements are not planned to receive public utilities, it is not the intent of the Plan to preclude the extension of utilities to existing villages and

settlements immediately adjacent to service districts. Further, it is not the intent of the Plan to preclude the extension of public utilities to defined villages and settlements, or portions thereof, or other identified areas immediately adjacent to Federal government facilities facing an imminent health hazard, as identified by the Virginia Department of Health, and where the landowner(s) has agreed to pay for the utility extension and the appropriate public Authority is willing to serve the defined village or settlement. Such extension of utilities will solely be for the benefit of existing dwelling units identified by the Health Department as being at risk to human health and potentially causing downstream environmental degradation. Prior to extension of public services to remedy an imminent health hazard, the boundaries of the “at risk” portion of the village or settlement must be specifically delineated based on parcel identification numbers and zoning information.

Since the adoption of the 1967 Plan, there has not been a great deal of development in the villages then designated (with one notable exception, Morrisville). Thus, time remains for more detailed planning prior to substantial inappropriate changes in these areas. Since 1967 however, considerable information has been gathered on this subject. First, the entire county was studied to insure that all appropriate communities were included. This resulted in an expanded list of over forty areas with some potential for designation as villages. Also, considerable data was collected about many aspects of these communities, both the natural and man-made assets and limitations, the history, and the situation currently existing in each.

## ■ INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND CLASSIFICATION

In an effort to determine which of the communities in the area identification list would be retained for further planning work and to set the general levels of future growth appropriate for those retained, the data collected were arranged in a chart, with each village assigned a rating for each of several factors ([see Figure 7.1](#), [Figure 7.1 Continued](#), [Figure 7.1 Continued](#)).

The information describes, generally, the area within a one mile radius of the village’s center. The study area for each community was adjusted in some cases due to the presence of dominating features such as major stream with a broad floodplain, a major highway, or another nearby village. The S-M-X ratings are used first to give an indication of how widely dispersed or tightly clustered the existing development appears. Then these ratings are used to show how extensive the limitations on future development are imposed by topography, drainfield suitability (percability), soils poor for building development, floodplain/flood prone areas, and road access. The figures listed under “Distance to Town” show how far, in miles, each village is from the following “major” and “minor” towns. The first number in the column is the distance to the nearest town. The second number is the distance to the nearest major town.

| <u>Minor</u> | <u>Major</u>   |
|--------------|----------------|
| Remington    | Warrenton      |
| The Plains   | Fredericksburg |
| Marshall     | Manassas       |
| Middleburg   | Culpeper       |
|              | Front Royal    |

The other factors are self-explanatory.

The villages listed in Figure 7.1 were found to divide most appropriately into four categories of future growth potential, “Village I, II, and III,” and “Settlement”. The Village I category applies to those very few communities with the greatest potential for future development, and the ability to support growth. These would eventually become small “service districts” in their own right, or extensions of the existing service districts. Those areas in the Village II category would be planned for in-filling of current pattern of development and some limited expansion. The Village III communities would be limited to in-fill only. The communities in each of these “village” categories are characterized by a traditional mix of land uses and facilities. The final category, Settlement, includes those areas in which there are only residential uses. These areas would be planned for in-fill growth only. However, unlike the Village III communities, provision would be made for rural residential uses only.

The determination of the appropriate category for each village was necessarily subjective and not based upon some complex formula. Factors considered positive in assigning a village to one of the higher growth categories included large numbers of current dwellings and substantial demand (under the current situation with respect to government regulation, technology, and market factors) as evidenced by numbers of recent housing starts in the area. Relatively dense clustering of existing development, (a slight or moderate rating on Dispersal of Development) counted toward a higher growth category. The public facilities and other factors in the next nine columns reflect the extent to which the villages serves as a focus in the lives of its inhabitants and those in the surrounding countryside, and indicate greater suitability for future growth. Positive ratings for higher growth categories in the next five columns are represented by the lower (slight and moderate) ratings on natural features and access. These ratings must be interpreted only in relative terms, as compared to other areas in this County. Finally, the presence of rail service and shorter distances to towns contributed to a village’s inclusion in a higher category. The opposite sorts of ratings from those just listed, of course, related to the lower village categories. Other pertinent information appears in the remarks column, providing information about the village’s ability to serve as a center for the surrounding rural area, its general ability to support growth, and its character. Each village’s ratings on the various assessment factors (Figure 7.1), its assignment to one of the

village/settlement categories (Table 7.1), its boundary delineation (to be discussed below), and any other planning decisions made concerning that village were subject to scrutiny by the community's residents, and the residents of the County as a whole. These individuals' comments were a primary factor in all of the final determinations indicated here, from the initial assessment to the ultimate plan for each. A more complete discussion of the citizen participation process appears in a subsequent section of this chapter. Although these factors had to be used together in a somewhat subjective process of categorizing the villages, the data were objectively based, and a consistent system of analyzing the differences between and among villages led to results that are both meaningful and useful.

As this process continued, and each of the villages was better understood, it was found that a few places on the original list were not suited for any of the four categories. These were deleted.

The need for further study of some of these villages is noted in the comments which follow, particularly concerning historic preservation. As time and information become available such additional study may be appropriate in other villages, either as a part of a five year review, or as a special study.

Table 7.1: Village/Settlement Categories

|                     | Village I-I     | Village II-II  |     |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----|
|                     | Village III-III | Settlement-S   |     |
|                     |                 |                |     |
| Ada                 | III             | Hume           | III |
| Airport Inn         | S               | Hurleytown     | S   |
| Ashville            | S               | Liberty        | II  |
| Atoka               | III             | Linden         | III |
| Belle Meade         | III             | Markham        | III |
| Belvoir/Bunker Hill | S               | Morgantown     | S   |
| Blackwelltown       | S               | Morrisville    | I   |
| Botha               | II              | Mount Holly    | S   |
| Bristerburg         | II              | New Baltimore  | II  |
| Casanova            | II              | Old Town       | II  |
| Cleavers Oak        | S               | Orlean         | III |
| Delaplane           | III             | Paris          | II  |
| Double Poplars      | S               | Pilgrim's Rest | S   |
| Elk Run             | II              | Rectortown     | II  |
| Eustace Corner      | II              | Somerville     | III |

|                  |     |              |     |
|------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Fauquier Springs | II  | Sowego       | III |
| Fletcher ville   | II  | St. Stephens | S   |
| Frogtown         | S   | Sumerduck    | II  |
| Frytown          | I   | The Sage     | S   |
| Goldvein         | III | Turnbull     | II  |
| Greenville       | II  | Upperville   | II  |
| Halfway          | III |              |     |

## ■ DELINEATION AND PLANNING

Following categorization of the villages and settlements, detailed delineation of each was possible. Each village's category, as well as key ratings on the chart ([Figure 7.1](#), [Figure 7.1 Continued](#), [Figure 7.1 Continued](#)) was used to determine the overall extent of future growth appropriate for the area, while actual source data was used to delineate the boundaries of the individual village and settlement districts. Thus, topography, soils, tax parcel maps, and highway plans were used directly. The use of the most pertinent source as the base map for each village results in the variation in the scales of the individual village maps which follow. In addition, to a bar scale on each of these maps, a dashed circle with a one-half mile radius is shown to give an idea of relative size. This circle represents existing SR-1 zoning in those villages already designated, and in all cases contains approximately 500 acres.

Factors reflected in Figure 7.1 as assets of limitations were used in detailed delineation of each village. Existing development and nearby areas of soils appropriate for building development were generally included while steep slopes, floodplains, and soils poor for rural residential development were generally excluded. Considerable flexibility was necessary, such as in cases where existing residential development and facilities indicated the appropriateness of village designation in an area possessing generally unfavorable natural features.

In most cases, village and settlement boundaries have been defined in a general manner based on the above noted factors. However, for the Village of Fletcher ville, boundaries have been specifically defined based on parcel identification numbers and zoning information for the purpose of remedying an existing health problem.

Since the Village I areas relate fairly closely with future service district type growth, these were planned in more detail. Not only were these villages delineated, but areas were planned for specific uses. This reflects their greater potential for relatively more urban-type future growth. Specific land use designations were appropriate also in some of the other villages, reflecting existing commercial zoning and uses. Discussion of this process can be found in the brief summaries for each village on the following

pages.

As in the preceding charts, the following plans for each of the villages are included in the order of the number of the tax map upon which they appear. Thus, those areas in the northwestern part of the County are first, while those in the southeastern part are last.

## ■ [MAP 7.1](#) FAUQUIER COUNTY VILLAGES AND SETTLEMENTS

### ■ [PARIS](#)

Due to topography, and reflecting the area of the existing community this category II village is shown to be entirely on the south side of Route 50 and west of Route 17. The Village District delineated includes existing development and areas appropriate for limited expansion while avoiding areas with limitations upon percolation, flood prone areas, and areas of soils not suited for building development. The Village Commercial district includes one gas station currently in operation and one store building not presently in use.

### ■ [UPPERVILLE](#)

The National Register of Historic Places includes the village of Upperville, a fine example of a traditional linear settlement pattern, and containing many significant structures. While Upperville contains the greatest diversity of non-residential uses of all of the places categorized as villages in Fauquier, and while it is one of the largest villages, containing well over one hundred homes, very little new construction has occurred in recent years. A principal reason for this lack of activity is sewage disposal. Very little soil in the area is suitable for septic drainfields; new sites are very difficult to find, and many existing systems are currently malfunctioning. This situation has discouraged renovation of the many fine structures, however needed in numerous cases, as well as new construction. The provision of central water and sewer service in Upperville could help to maintain the viability of the community and encourage its revitalization and restoration. The assimilation capacity of the streams in the area is small; therefore, it does not appear feasible to provide a sewage disposal system for the area that could provide for a great deal of growth. Although Upperville is fairly accessible to Washington, lying within the suburban fringe, it is unlikely that families with an interest in historic places and old homes, and capable of the expensive restoration often necessary, would be willing to move to a house without complete indoor plumbing (including laundry facilities).

For over twenty years, the Virginia Department of Transportation has been considering alternate route locations for a Route 50 by-pass around Upperville. This is badly needed to alleviate traffic problems, which are particularly acute on the weekends. Three routes are currently under consideration, one to the south of the village, and two to the north. Although it is expected to be many years before any by-pass is

constructed, its design and location are of great importance to the village. This matter should be studied further in order that a solution can be developed which is best suited to the future of Upperville. If the chosen route is to be near the existing village (as are all three current Virginia Department of Transportation's alternatives), consideration should be given to including a linear buffer, providing open space between the road and the settled area. This would be an asset to both the town and the users of the road.

The delineation appearing here is based on existing development, the village's location adjacent to Loudoun County, land holding patterns, floodplain/prone areas and other soil limitations.

Further planning and preservation study of this village are necessary. Means, such as the establishment of an historic district in accordance with the County's Zoning Ordinance, should be found to solve problems such as sewage disposal and traffic, and accommodation of such facilities as the by-pass and possibly sewer and water systems, without adversely affecting the valuable character of Upperville.

#### ■ [ATOKA](#)

Delineated areas reflect existing development and uses, land holding patterns, and the general lack of suitable soils in this category III village.

#### ■ [RECTORTOWN](#)

Soil conditions including percolation, soils underlain by pans, and areas subject to wet conditions were important factors in the delineation of this category II village. These factors are present to some extent, in areas of existing development, but were found to allow for limited areas of expansion, topography also being a constraint. There is potential for a public water system to be constructed to alleviate existing homes. While the commercial activities at the intersection of Routes 624 and 713 (near the railroad tracks) are not properly part of this village, they are not in conflict with its plan. The village commercial area reflects existing use.

#### ■ [LINDEN& EXTENSION OF LINDEN BOUNDARY](#)

This small village (category III) is bounded by Interstate 66 to the north and Warren County to the west. The area included takes advantage of areas of better soils but is constrained by steep slopes.

#### ■ [BELLE MEADE](#)

Like Linden, this community lies along both Interstate 66 and Goose Creek. Only very limited areas are suitable for development due to steep slopes, the railroad, the Goose Creek bottom, and the Interstate. The new road will not include an interchange in this area, but will eliminate much traffic from Route 55, increasing the area's suitability for rural village development.

### ■ [MARKHAM](#)

This small village has substantial historical significance, as documented by the Virginia Landmarks Commission, and should be studied further to determine appropriate means of preserving the historic structures and distinctive character of the community. This should be done as soon as possible in order to mitigate against possible adverse impacts of the interchange on Interstate 66 at Route 688. The area delineated here reflects existing development, areas subject to flooding and internal circulation. This boundary should also be reviewed in detail as part of the historical preservation study already mentioned. Village Commercial areas reflect the existing uses.

### ■ [THE SAGE](#)

This settlement included areas of existing development and allows for expansion where permitted by the fairly rugged topography. Percolation in much of the area delineated is severely limited.

### ■ [DELAPLANE](#)

This old rural center has severe limitations for further development, the most critical problems including topography, internal circulation, and poor percolation. Also, much of the center of this category III village is in the floodplain of Goose Creek. While the plan for Delaplane shows no intensive uses in this floodplain area, the existing commercial enterprises do not conflict with this plan. The village residential districts reflect areas of existing development. Although beyond the scope of this plan, at this point, it would seem appropriate to begin consideration of constructing a short by-pass on Route 17 to the west of its current alignment and providing a grade separation at the railroad tracks.

### ■ [FROGTOWN](#)

This small settlement has severe limitations on further development, primarily due to the areas of soils poor for percolation and steep slopes. The delineation here reflects existing development and topography. A contemplated central water system would help to maintain this community and increase the possibility of a limited number of additional homes.

### ■ [HALFWAY](#)

This category III village is delineated to include essentially the area of existing development, and a small amount of contiguous land limited by steep slopes and the floodplain of Little River and its tributaries. Also reflected in these boundaries is the large amount of land in the area subject to open space easements. The Settlement and Village districts seek to differentiate in accord with the existing character of the various areas. The Village Commercial districts reflect existing and traditional uses of non-residential structures.



### ■ [ASHVILLE](#)

This settlement includes the area of existing development as well as a limited contiguous area with soil conditions better than those generally found in the built-up area. Topography also constrains the boundaries of this community.

### ■ [ADA](#)

The outline of this category III village includes the area of existing development and a limited area for new homes in an area constrained by topography and soils unsuitable for dwellings.

### ■ [MORGANTOWN & EXTENSION OF MORGANTOWN BOUNDARY](#)

Although categorized as a settlement, Morgantown has considerably more potential for further development than either of the two preceding communities. This potential is reflected in a relatively large number of new homes being built there in recent years. The outline shown here recognizes areas already developed, and takes advantage of contiguous areas with soils suited to rural residential development on relatively small lots.

### ■ [BELVOIR-BUNKER HILL](#)

This area includes spotty residential development on fairly small lots, with little new construction activity in recent years. The area delineated in the Settlement district represents the general outline of what has been developed which, in turn, reflects soil characteristics to a great extent. The two schools located nearby and good road access makes this area well suited for in-fill development. Although much of this community lies in the Occoquan watershed, it may become practical to serve at least part of it with public sewer, utilizing a force main completed recently along the north side of Route 55. Future plan update efforts should monitor this possibility and its potential for change in the character of this community.

### ■ [HUME](#)

Existing development is the primary rationale for both the categorization (Village III) and delineation of the Hume community. Based on soil characteristics and topography alone, and not considering tradition and cultural factors, a village would not be planned at this site.

### ■ [OLD TAVERN](#)

The assets of good and favorable soils and topography dictate the allowing for substantial expansion of this category II village from its current small size.

### ■ [ORLEAN](#)

Existing development is the main factor in delineating this category III village. The built-up area includes

spotty areas of soils with a variety of problems; however, a contiguous area of suitable soils is included to allow for limited expansion.

#### ■ FLETCHERVILLE & FLETCHERVILLE HEALTH REMEDIATION DISTRICT

The fairly rugged topography is the prime factor in the delineation of this category II village. Areas for limited expansion beyond the area of existing relatively dense development reflect these slope problems as well as soil conditions (mainly percolation).

#### ■ PILGRIM REST

The area included within the Pilgrim Rest Settlement District reflects existing development and the limited availability of land with suitable soils.

#### ■ NEW BALTIMORE

Natural and historic factors determine the outline of this old village. Several historic structures are included in this area, suggesting that the establishment of an historic district or other means of preserving the character of the area might be appropriate for at least the portion east of South Run. Delineation of the districts shown is based on the floodplain of South Run, soil characteristics (percolation), topography (fairly rugged in adjacent areas), and existing development.

#### ■ GREENVILLE

This category II village is in an area with numerous natural constraints on development which are reflected in the delineation shown here. These include soils subject to flooding, poor for percolation, and poor for building development, and adverse terrain. Access to this community, its proximity to Vint Hill Farms Station, and some recent development activity in the area indicated the appropriateness of in-fill development and limited expansion of this community.

#### ■ TURNBULL

Although this community has considerable potential for growth based on natural features, access limitations constrain overall levels of expansion. Existing development, soil condition, land holding patterns, and existing zoning were used to determine the delineation appearing here. A small existing public water system, currently being expanded, enhances this community's potential for further development on relatively small lots.

#### ■ FRYTOWN

This is one of the very few villages in the County to be designated "Category I". Its proximity to Warrenton and its fairly large current population (although moderately dispersed) would seem to indicate

that it should be included in the Warrenton Service District. However, as discussed in detail in Chapter 6, it will be difficult to provide public sewer service in this area, in the next few years at least. Thus, this plan represents an effort to encourage continuation of the past and current pattern of development with a center in the area of the intersecting Routes 672 and 674. The construction of a public water system for this area would encourage development in the area delineated on smaller lots which could more feasibly be incorporated into the service district later on. Natural features, internal circulation, and existing development determined the outlines shown here, with floodplains and terrain being the primary constraints.

#### ■ [DOUBLE POPLARS](#)

The majority of the development currently existing at this small settlement is in an area characterized by soils generally poor for building development. However, a contiguous area to the west seems very well-suited for rural residential development, and is included as an expansion area for this community.

#### ■ [ST. STEPHENS](#)

The area included in the settlement districts shown here represents in-fill and limited expansion of existing strip residential development into contiguous areas with potential for percolation and avoiding areas of soils for building development.

#### ■ [FAUQUIER SPRINGS](#)

Similar to nearby Turnbull, Fauquier Springs possesses natural features suiting it well to rural residential growth, but is constrained to a considerable extent by road access problems not likely to be solved in the immediate future. The delineation shown here reflects existing development, land holding patterns, soil limitations (percolation, although conditions are generally, relatively good), and the floodplains of the Rappahannock River and its tributaries.

#### ■ [HURLEYTOWN](#)

Although this is currently a relatively small community, a fairly large contiguous area is included within the boundaries shown here, reflecting the suitability of the land for small lot residential use.

#### ■ [CASANOVA](#)

This village has considerable potential for future development in terms of natural features, and has experienced substantial activity recently. However, it is bisected by a railroad line, has somewhat limited access, and is bounded in several directions by large lot subdivisions. Other constraints involved in the determination of the boundaries shown here were soils inappropriate for construction, floodplain, and soils with limitations for percolation.

### ■ [BOTHA](#)

In terms of natural features, this category II village is well suited for development into a substantial rural village; however, access is somewhat limited. The land included is generally well-suited in terms of soil characteristics. Delineation reflects mainly soil problems including floodplain and flood-prone soils and poorly-drained soils.

### ■ [LIBERTY](#)

Near the Bealeton Service District and served by Route 17, Liberty is well-suited for development, including limited expansion beyond the area of moderately dispersed existing development. Constraints used in the delineation here were floodplain and soils poor for building development or percolation. Access to the village district along Route 17 should be from Route 837 only.

### ■ [EUSTACE CORNER](#)

The delineation of this category II village, now characterized as primarily a rural strip residential, reflects the area of existing development and uses, percolation (limited) and the immediate water supply shed of the Licking Run Impoundment.

### ■ [BRISTERBURG](#)

Soils poor for development, floodplains, small areas of steep slope, and soils poor for percolation were the main factors in determining the boundaries shown for this category II village. Overall size is limited due to access.

### ■ [SOWEGO](#)

This area has general limitations for septic systems and is rather remote. Delineation reflects primarily floodplains and soils poor for development. The blank areas near the center of this category III village indicate areas with problem soils which may be found to be usable on a site specific basis, probably for non-residential uses.

### ■ [BLACKWELLTOWN](#)

This small settlement area south of the Midland Service District is developed in a relatively widely dispersed pattern. Thus, the area shown, reflecting existing development contains considerable land for development. However, soil limitations for percolation will, in turn, limit overall future growth. A substantial area of heavy industrial zoning adjacent to this settlement is not well served in terms of access and is not entirely compatible with this settlement as it existing or may grow.

### ■ [ELK RUN](#)

This fairly remote rural village appears to possess substantial ability to support development within its fairly widely dispersed existing development. Delineation is constrained mainly by areas of floodplain characteristics (principally percolation) on a site specific basis.

### ■ MORRISVILLE

As one of the very few category I villages, and as the center of an area exhibiting considerable demand for development, Morrisville was studied in considerable detail. Similar to the procedures followed in the service districts, three alternative plans were developed for Morrisville for consideration by the Planning Commission. Based on the concept that the village is the central focus of a fairly sizeable, growing area of suburban, low density residential development, that this trend of development around the village will continue, and that such a suburban community should have a viable, identifiable focus providing higher density residential areas and an adequate range of commercial and employment facilities, the alternative shown here was chosen.

This plan for Morrisville is also based on the concept that public sewer and water services will be provided for this central area in the coming years. Although it is impossible to predict reliably when these facilities will be available, this plan seeks to establish a service base for a first increment in the phased development of such utilities over a period of years. While this planning approach is similar to that employed in the New Baltimore Service District, it is possible to be somewhat more specific concerning the future of Morrisville, as it is not in the Occoquan watershed.

The areas indicated “V/II” are to be zoned now for village district uses, and to higher density zones when sewer becomes available. Similarly, the “V/I” areas are to be zoned village now, and to lower density (sewered) uses when the utilities are built. The “Future” areas should be held in a holding zone until a service base is established in the Village districts and the necessary facilities constructed. Hopefully, most low density development in the near future will be discouraged by the promise of sewered density zoning in the long run. This phasing program is based on the location of a sewage treatment plant of Rock Run, with first phase pumping stations on the Harpers Run tributaries at Route 17 in the first place. Later phases would include pumping stations on the Sumerduck Run tributaries.

Specific factors employed in the delineation here include existing development and uses, in and around the area included, estimated stream assimilation capacity, utility planning, and access. Implementation of this plan should insure minimal direct access from Route 17.

### ■ SOMERVILLE

Development at the center of this area is precluded by soils inappropriate for building development (which do not generally percolate). The areas shown here are delineated to reflect soils and terrain

suitable for rural residential development and are limited to land within one mile of the village's center. The village commercial at the center reflects an existing use. Other non-residential uses may be found to be appropriate in this vicinity, on an individual basis.

#### ■ [MT. HOLLY](#)

The delineation of this small strip settlement is determined by existing development, topography (in some areas, severe) and in areas not suitable for septic drainfields.

#### ■ [SUMERDUCK](#)

This village, although remote, contains a particularly viable community. Access limits overall size. One of the most important determinations of the boundaries of this village, as well as many other aspects of life in the community was the State game preserve along the west side of the community. Other factors in the delineation of this village were existing development and land holding patterns, steep slopes and limitations on percolation.

#### ■ [GOLDVEIN](#)

Substantial future development in the Goldvein area is not indicated due to pervasive adverse soil conditions. Areas included in the village reflect existing development and land holding patterns, existing zoning, and areas prone to flooding. The Village Commercial area reflects existing uses and zoning.

#### ■ [AIRPORT INN](#)

#### ■ [CLEAVERS OAK](#)

#### ■ IMPLEMENTATION

This discussion of planning for residential land uses throughout the County has included a wide range of types of development and styles of life. The growth which has occurred in the County's service districts can be characterized generally as suburban. The current zoning ordinance appropriately includes most of the service districts in "Suburban Residential" zones of various densities. In addition to permitting single family detached homes as a right, these zones allow many commercial and industrial uses by special use permit. These uses would normally be permitted in areas and at times where they would not conflict with suburban residential development, generally not in the immediate vicinity of existing subdivisions. Also allowed by special use permit are "home occupations" conducted only within a dwelling, and only by its occupants. These seem to be appropriate limitations for activities conducted in homes situated in suburban neighborhoods.

While these regulations suit the more urban-related areas of the County, they are not well suited for uses in the County's more rural-oriented villages, being in some ways too restrictive, and in others excessively

liberal. It is sufficiently doubtful that many of the uses allowed by special use permit in the SR zones would be appropriate in a village that the requirement for rezoning for such uses in villages seems justified. On the other hand, the restrictions on the “home occupations” necessary in the SR zones are excessive. To allow home occupations, as currently defined in the Zoning Ordinance, by right in “Village Residential” zones would suit the character of these areas and better serve the needs of the residents. Other, slightly more extensive uses might in many cases be appropriate, and could be controlled by the use permit process. These uses could be characterized as “cottage industries,” and would be of the same nature as home occupations, but allowing employment of a limited number of persons not residing on the site, and permitting use of an accessory building for business, in accordance with a use permit in the Village Residential zone. Such development would be only of a relatively small scale, and not of a size or character which would tend to adversely alter the character of the neighborhood. The health aspects of such developments must be considered carefully, as most of these villages will not have public sewer service in the foreseeable future. In order to provide adequate controls for multi-family development in the villages, they should be allowed only by special use permit.

A similar problem exists with employing the existing commercial zoning regulations in villages. These zones were designed with the planned service districts in mind, and include numerous uses not usually appropriate in villages. Instead of using these “service district commercial” zones in the villages, a “Village Commercial” zone should be developed which would allow uses serving the needs of the village’s residents and those of the surrounding countryside, but not permitting those uses better located in service districts and in which might tend to adversely alter the character of a village were they so located. In order to be flexible in the location of the very small amount of land needed for commercial uses in each village, specific areas are not planned for such use in most cases. Consequently, no areas are to be zoned for commercial uses in the villages, except to reflect existing, appropriately located activities, at this time. Later on, upon request and with adequate justification, additional Village Commercial areas suitably located will be rezoned to reflect the current needs of the community.

The areas designated as “Settlements” above are those in which little growth is planned, and commercial facilities would not generally be appropriate or required. While these areas are like the villages in being poor locations for much of what is permitted in the SR zones with a special use permit, the “cottage industries” would not tend to be compatible. However, home occupations, as found in the SR zones could be allowed by use permit in the Settlement districts. Portions of some of the villages are designated “Settlement,” reflecting the character of that part of the community.

Reflecting the existing character of many of these villages, the minimum sizes of residential lots could be reduced in areas served by public water systems. The lot size minimum could safely be reduced to something on the order of 25,000 square feet with corresponding reductions in setbacks. In areas served

by individual wells, the one acre minimum must be retained.

To summarize these Village Zoning districts, the “Village Residential” zone would allow home occupations as a right and “cottage industries” by special use permit. The “Settlement” zone would allow only home occupations, and then only by special use permit. The various other commercial and industrial uses allowed by special use permit in the Suburban Residential zones would not be allowed in either the Village Residential or Settlement zones. The “Village Commercial” zone would allow only those commercial uses serving the village and the surrounding countryside. Minimum lot size in villages would be reduced to about 25,000 square feet with public water systems and 40,000 square feet without.

## ■ CITIZEN INPUT

Drafts of the above text and sketches of the maps were presented and discussed at public information meetings held in the northern, central, and southern parts of the County. Copies of pertinent sections and maps were made available to interested parties. Some village residents and some residing elsewhere in the County discussed the drafts in person with members of the Board, the Planning Commission, and the staff throughout the process of developing this chapter of the Plan. Information and comments received from the public through these means, as well as at the public hearing held on this chapter and the next, were incorporated into the Plan presented here, including all phases of the process, from data collection to means of implementation.

Thus, most of all, this plan for the villages and settlements seeks to fulfill the needs and desires of the people of Fauquier County, and to serve as an integral part of the plans for the County as a whole.